## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/531,339	TSUBOI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ANNA L. VERDERAME	1795	

	ANNA L. VERDERAME	1795		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.		
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	_ED WITHIN TWO	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	liance with 27 CED 41 27 must be t	iilad within two month	of the data of	
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
AMENDMENTS				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in bet</li> </ul>	**	lucina or cimplifuina t	aa laawaa far	
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	aucing or simplifying ti	le issues ioi	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).	
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the	
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of	
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>8-14</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a	
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>				
12.	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
/Mark F. Huff/	// 1 ///			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795	/A. L. V./ Examiner, Art Unit 1795			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Tonoi does not teach the structure recited in claim 1. In particular the applicant argues that Tonoi does not teach a medium in which the recording layer closest to the substrate absorbs at the longest wavelength and layers further from the substrate are formed so that the layers decrease in absorption wavelength as the layer is closer to the surface layer in stacked order. Tonoi teaches an embodiment in which the layers are formed on a substrate in the order red, blue, green. Tonoi also discloses an arrangement in which blue, green red layers are formed in that order on a substrate. Based on these disclosures the examiner argues that it would be obvious to modify the order of the layers in the embodiment by changing the order of the green and blue layers. The examiner further notes that the benefit of Tonoi are the same as those claimed by the applicant including formation of a more accurate, finer and clearer multiple color image.(abstract). The examiner further notes that when the material of the substrate is clear, recording can be carried out from either side. The examiner has provided sufficient motivation for the alternate formation of laminate or mixed recording layers in the final office action dated 04/25/2008.